

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 have been amended to include labels for better descriptiveness.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-25 are all the claims pending in the application.

The previous rejection of claims 1-5, 7-17, and 20-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,491,257 to Emmons Jr., et al. ("Emmons") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,922 to Lazaris-Brunner et al. ("Lazaris-Brunner") and the previous rejection of claims 6 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Emmons in view of Lazaris-Brunner in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0135511 to Zhao et al. ("Zhao") have been withdrawn.

New prior art rejections have been made.

The claims have been amended in a non-narrowing manner for the sake of improved conformity to US practice. No new matter has been added.

Consideration and entry of the amendments are respectfully requested.

Response to Drawing Objection

Applicant thanks the Examiner for participating in a brief telephone discussion on May 16, 2008 to discuss the Examiner's drawing objections. Accordingly, Applicant amends the drawings to include the text labels recommended by the Examiner. The objection to the drawings is respectfully submitted to be overcome by the replacement drawing sheets submitted herewith.

Response to Nonstatutory Obviousness-type Double Patenting Rejection

Since the rejection is provisional, Applicant holds in abeyance the filing of any terminal disclaimer.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,101,267 to Morales-Garza ("Morales-Garza") in view of Lazaris-Brunner.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner takes the position that Morales-Garza teaches a satellite-based monitoring, measurement or data collection system comprising: a monitoring, measurement or data collection system having a plurality of monitoring stations (4) for remote monitoring, measurement or data collection and for providing data, to respective

computation centers (3), and; a satellite system using at least one satellite (2) having an on-board processor for multiplexing up-link data received and broadcasting said multiplexed data in a down-link transmission; wherein: said up-link data received by said satellite (2) comprises a digital channel corresponding to a respective one of said computation centers (3); said respective computation center (3) is connected to a down-link adapter (7) connected to a receiver or group of receivers (6); and said down-link adapter is adapted for extracting, from said down-link transmission, said digital channel corresponding only to the said respective computation center (3).

The Examiner acknowledges that Morales-Garza does not teach the function of an adapter of extracting a digital channel but takes the position that Lazaris-Brunner teaches such an adapter and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references as the Examiner describes.

Applicants respectfully submit that Morales-Garza does not teach limitations presently claimed and that Lazaris-Brunner does not make up the deficiency to arrive at the present claims.

First, Morales-Garza does not teach “respective computation centers.” The Examiner takes the position that column 3, lines 21-30 teach this recitation. Morales-Garza does teach a plurality of response units communicating with a plurality of local area repeater stations; but the local area repeater stations do not communicate with “respective computation centers.” Instead, Morales-Garza teaches that “the repeater stations then communicate by intermediate satellite transmission channels to a central data center that receives the local signals to consolidate them into a nation-wide response result” (column 2, lines 15-19). The nature of invention of Morales-Garza is that a “network of local area audience response systems is coupled together at a *central audience response processing station* by means of a satellite communication system for real time audience response analysis, nationally or internationally” (Abstract, emphasis added).

Accordingly, Morales-Garza does not teach a “digital channel corresponding to a respective one of said computation centers” because Morales-Garza teaches only a central data center rather than computation centers respective to a plurality of monitoring stations.

Second, Morales-Garza does not teach “an on-board processor for multiplexing up-link data received and broadcasting said multiplexed data in a down-link transmission.” The Examiner takes the position that column 3, lines 21-30 and column 4 lines 28-40 teach this

recitation. Morales-Garza, however, simply teaches that satellites may have equipment that “may distinguish between the transmissions from various local repeater stations to prevent interference or to permit simultaneous transmission on separate frequency bands” (column 4, lines 30-33).

Applicant respectfully submits that the simultaneous transmission on *separate frequency bands* taught by Morales-Garza does not encompass the presently claimed multiplexing. Applicant discloses at [0045] of the published application that the “satellite (2) comprises an on-board processor (21) of any type known in the related art, for receiving said up-link data, multiplexing said data into a bit stream and broadcasting the multiplexed data bit stream directly to a plurality of computation units (C).”

The Examiner does not take the position that Lazaris-Brenner makes up for any of these deficiencies.

Applicant submits that even if the references were combined one of ordinary skill in the art would not (and could not) have arrived at the presently claimed system. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-13 and 20-25 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons directed to claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 14, the Examiner takes the position that Morales-Garza teaches a method for interconnecting elements of a monitoring, measurement or data collection using a satellite system, comprising: remote monitoring, measurement or data collection by means of a plurality of monitoring stations (4) and providing data to respective computation centers (3), and; at least one satellite (2) of said system multiplexing up-link data by means of an on-board processor and broadcasting said multiplexed data in down-link transmission; transmitting a digital channel in said up-link data to said satellite (2), said channel corresponding to a respective computation center (3), said computation center (3) being connected to a down-link adapter (7) connected to a satellite receiver or a group of satellite receivers (6); and extracting from said down-link transmission, by said down-link adapter, only said digital channel corresponding to the respective computation center (3).

The Examiner acknowledges that Morales-Garza does not teach the function of an adapter of extracting a digital channel but takes the position that Lazaris-Brunner teaches such an adapter and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references as the Examiner describes.

Applicants respectfully submit that Morales-Garza does not teach limitations presently claimed and that Lazaris-Brunner does not make up the deficiency to arrive at the present claims.

First, Morales-Garza does not teach “respective computation centers.” The Examiner takes the position that column 3, lines 21-30 teach this recitation. Morales-Garza does teach a plurality of response units communicating with a plurality of local area repeater stations; but the local area repeater stations do not communicate with “respective computation centers.” Instead, Morales-Garza teaches that “the repeater stations then communicate by intermediate satellite transmission channels to a central data center that receives the local signals to consolidate them into a nation-wide response result” (column 2, lines 15-19). The nature of invention of Morales-Garza is that a “network of local area audience response systems is coupled together at a *central audience response processing station* by means of a satellite communication system for real time audience response analysis, nationally or internationally” (Abstract, emphasis added).

Accordingly, Morales-Garza does not teach a “channel corresponding to a respective computation centers” because Morales-Garza teaches only a central data center rather than computation centers respective to a plurality of monitoring stations.

Second, Morales-Garza does not teach “an on-board processor and broadcasting said multiplexed data in a down-link transmission.” The Examiner takes the position that column 3, lines 21-30 and column 4 lines 28-40 teach this recitation. Morales-Garza, however, simply teaches that satellites may have equipment that “may distinguish between the transmissions from various local repeater stations to prevent interference or to permit simultaneous transmission on separate frequency bands” (column 4, lines 30-33).

Applicant respectfully submits that the simultaneous transmission on *separate frequency bands* taught by Morales-Garza does not encompass the presently claimed multiplexing. Applicant discloses at [0045] of the published application that the “satellite (2) comprises an on-board processor (21) of any type known in the related art, for receiving said up-link data,

multiplexing said data into a bit stream and broadcasting the multiplexed data bit stream directly to a plurality of computation units (C).”

The Examiner does not take the position that Lazaris-Brenner makes up for any of these deficiencies.

Applicant submits that even if the references were combined one of ordinary skill in the art would not (and could not) have arrived at the presently claimed system. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 15-19 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons directed to claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant herewith petitions the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time, if necessary. Unless a check is attached, any fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System, or if not paid through EFS, the USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

/Kelly G. Hyndman 39,234/
Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

Date: June 30, 2008